82-442

Office - Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
AUG 23 1982
ALEXANDER L. STEVAS,
CLERK

No._____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
OCTOBER TERM, 1982

FRANK J. CALVO,

PETITIONER,

vs.

LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT, et al.,

RESPONDENT.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT AND REQUEST FOR SUMMARY REVERSAL

FRANK J. CALVO
4312 Saugus Avenue
Sherman Oaks, California 91403
Telephone: (213) 784-7967

Pro Se for Petitioner

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

.1. Whether the District Court and the Ninth Circuit Panel had the responsibility and right (discretion) to decide issues of fact - including determining the intent of respondent-defendants, whether or not malice and bad faith existed, whether fraud existed in the school district's (respondent-def) attempt to circumvent the due process protection provided by Cal Ed Cd section 13443 and other sections of the California Education Code; or whether it was the responsibility of the trial court (jury) to decide such issues of fact after completion of discovery and submission of petitioner's evidence? The Ninth Cir Panel did not address itself to this issue, though the Ninth Cir Panel was fully briefed on this issue, and appears to have overlooked the fact that petitioner Calvo never had a trial of the merits of his case.

.2. Whether there are constitutional limitations upon the power of courts to decide an action without allowing a party to be heard on the merits, where the denial of petitioner Calvo's right to a trial on the merits raises substantial constitutional questions the gravity of which is accented by the fact that petitioner is seeking to avoid deprivation of his 14th Amendment Section 1 right to due process?

.3. Whether the Ninth Cir Panel should have ruled that petitioner won his case in 1974, because respondent-defs failed to respond to petitioner's REQUEST FOR ADMISSION OF FACTS as required by Federal Rules of Civil Procedure Rule 36(a)? And was it correct for the Ninth Cir Panel to disregard the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals ruling in O'Campo v. Hardisty, 262 F. 2d 621, 625; 1 F. R. D. Serv. 2d 56 c. 33, Case 1 (9th Cir 1958) which held that a party must respond to another party's REQUESTS FOR ADMISSIONS OF FACT?

LIST OF OTHER PARTIES

The only other parties not listed in the caption are respondents:

Wm. B. Brown, Associate Superintendent of Personnel
Pat E. Turner, Associate Superintendent of Personnel
W.K. Fitt, Supervisor in Personnel
Frank Fittin, Supervisor in Personnel
Wm. B. Spaeter, Supervisor in Personnel
A.J. Shugg, Supervisor in Personnel
Robert T. Green, Personnel

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Questions Presented for Review	i
Opinion Below	2
Jurisdiction	2
Constitutional Provision Involved	2
Statement of the Case	2
Reasons for Granting the Writ	4
A. The Decision Below Affirms the Right of a Magistrate in a Summary Judgment Proceeding to Deprive a Plaintiff a Trial on the Merits Concerning Plaintiff's 14th Amendment Section 1 Right to Due Process and therefor Conflicts with the Decisions of Other Circuits and this Court on this Matter.	4
B. There Are Constitutional Limitations Upon the Power of Courts to Decide an Action Without Allowing a Party to be Heard on the Merits.	5
C. In its Application of FRCP Rule 36(a) and (b), the Decision Below is in Conflict with its own Ninth Circuit's Decision in O'Campo v. Hardisty, 262 F. 2d 621, 625, (9th Cir 1958), in Conflict with the Decisions of Other Circuits and that of this Court.	6
Conclusion	9

Appendices are attached as one book, under a separate cover.

Appendix A	
Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 36(a)	A-1
Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 36(b)	A-2
California Education Code, Section 13443, (recod. 44949)	A-3, A-4
Appendix B	
Opinion Below	B-1 to B-5
Appendix C	
Order denying rehearing	C
Appendix D	
Second Amended Complaint	D

Appendix E
Request for Admission of Facts, fld. Mar 18, 1974 ..... E-1 to E-20
Request for Admission of Facts, fld. Oct 29, 1974..... E-21 to E-35
Appendix F
Civil Docket Sheets. United States District Court..... F-1 to F-13

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases:

Adventures in Good Eating v. Best Places to Eat, C.C.A. 7th, 1942, 131 F. 2d 809..... 7
Batson v. Porter, C.C.A. 4th, 1946, 154 F. 2d 566 8
Beacon Theatres v. Westover, 359 U.S. 500, 501 10
Chicago, R.I. & P.R. Co. v. Williams, CA 8th, 1957, 245 F. 2d 397, certiorari denied, 78 S. Ct. 83, 355 U.S. 855, 2 L. Ed. 2d 63 8
City of Rome v. U.S., D.C.D.c. 1978, 100 S. Ct. 1548, 446 U.S. 156, 64 L. Ed. 2d 119 ... 7, 8
Cram v. Sun Ins. Office Ltd., 375 F. 2d 670, 11 F. R. Serv. 2d 56c, 41, Case 1 (CA 4th, 1967) 4
Dick v. New York Life Ins., Co., 359 U.S. 437 10
Dimick v. Schiedt, 293 U.S. 474, 486 10
Gallick v. Baltimore & Ohio R. Co., 372 U.S. 108, 116-117 10
General Steel Prod. Co. v. Lorenz, D.C. Fla. 1962, 204 F. Supp. 518, affirmed, CA 5th, 1964, 337 F. 2d 726 8
Gibson v. Phillips Petroleum Co., 352 U.S. 874 10
Grass v. Southern Ry. Co., 414 F. 2d 292, 13 F.R. Serv. 2d 56c, 41,

Case 3 (CA 5th 1969) 5
In re Jaylaw Drug, Inc., C.A. N.Y. 1980,
621 F 2d 524 7
John Mohr & Sons v. Apex Terminal Warehouses, Inc.,
CA 7th, 1970, 422 F. 2d 638 8
Loew's Inc. v. Bays,
209 F. 2d 610, 19 F. R. Serv. 56c, 41,
(CA 5th 1954) 4
Mangan v. Broderick & Bascom Rope Co.,
CA 7th, 1965, 351 F. 2d 24, certiorari denied,
86 S. Ct. 930, 383 U.S. 926, 15 L. Ed 2d 846 8
McSparran v. Hanigan, D.C. Pa. 1963,
225 F. Supp. 628, 636-637, affirmed, CA 3d, 1965,
356 F. 2d 983 8
Miller v. San Sebastian Gold Mines, Inc.,
CA Florida 1976, 540 F. 2d 807 7
O'Campo v. Hardisty,
262 F. 2d 621, 625 (9th Cir 1958) 6, 7
Rogers v. Missouri Pacific R. Co.,
352 U.S. 500, 510 10
Smyth v. Kaufman, C.C.A. 2d, 1940,
114 F. 2d 40, 130 A. L. R. 951 8
Societe International Pour Participationes Industrie
et Commercials, S.A. v. Rogers, 1958,
78 S. Ct. 1087, 1094, 357 U.S. 197, 209,
2 L. Ed. 2d 1255 5
U.S. ex rel. Seals v. Wiman, CA 5th, 1962
304 F. 2d 53, 63, certiorari denied, 1963,
83 S. Ct. 717, 372 U.S. 915, 9 L. Ed. 2d 722,
83 S. Ct. 741, 372 U.S. 924, 9 L. Ed. 2d 729 ... 7
Warren v. International Broth. of Teamsters
Chauffers, Warehousemen & Helpers of America,
CA 8th 1976, 544 F. 2d 334 7
Wilkerson v. McCarthy,
336 U.S. 70-71 10

Constitution and Statutes:

Constitutional Provisions Involved

United States Constitution, Amend. V 2

United States Constitution, Article 5, Amendment 14, section 1 ..... 3, 4, 6, 9

Rules of the Court Involved

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure Rule 36(a) 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure Rule 36(b) 6, 7, 8, 9, 10

Federal Statutes

28 USC, Section 1254 (1) 2

28 USC Sections 1331 & 1343(3) & (4) 3

42 USC, Section 1983, Civil Rights Act of 1871 ... 3

California Statute

California Education Code section 13443 (recodified section 44949) 4, 6

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1982

No._____

FRANK J. CALVO,

PETITIONER,

v.

LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT, et al.,

RESPONDENT.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT AND REQUEST FOR SUMMARY REVERSAL

The petitioner, Frank J. Calvo, respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit entered on 27 May 1982.

OPINION BELOW

The Court of Appeals entered its Memorandum decision affirming the district court's summary judgment in favor of respondents on 27 May 1982. A copy of the memorandum is attached separately as Appendix B.

The Court denied petitioner's petition for rehearing and suggestion for rehearing en banc on 27 July 1982. A copy of the order is separately attached as Appendix C.

JURISDICTION

On 27 May the Court of Appeals entered judgment affirming the district court's summary judgment in favor of respondents. (App. B) The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under Title 28, United States Code, Section 1254(1). No other petitioner is involved in this petition.

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION INVOLVED

United States Constitution, Amendment V:

> Nor shall any person be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law . . . .

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This case originated upon the filing of a complaint (App. D) in September 1973 by petitioner Calvo to redress the deprivation of property interest, to a science teaching position, without due process, under color of law, and for damages.

The district court entered summary judgment on January 28, 1981, in favor of respondents, a school district, and abused its discretion by ignoring, without giving reasons, the cross-motion of petitioner Calvo for summary judgment in his favor. In December 1980, the Magistrate calendared petitioner's cross-motion for consideration in February 1981, but the case was dismissed on January 27, 1981, tho later petitioner asked the district court to vacate its order. This motion was denied.

Petitioner appealed. The three Judge Panel of the Ninth Circuit affirmed the district court's summary judgment on 27 May 1982 by deciding a question of fact, viz., 'Was petitioner a probationary teacher?', a question that should have been decided by the trial court, including issues of whether fraud - malice - bad faith existed, after discovery is completed and submission of evidence. The petitioner never had a trial on the merits.

The Ninth Cir Panel ignored the issue raised and fully briefed by petitioner, that petitioner Calvo won his lawsuit in 1974 because respondents (defs) failed to respond to requests for admissions filed in 1974, thereby admitting all the allegations in the complaint which were contained as statements for admission in the Requests for Admission. (App. B) The district court likewise ignored this failure by respondents to comply with FRCP Rule 36(a), though petitioner fully briefed this matter in the cross-motion for summary judgment. Both the district court and the Ninth Circuit abused their discretion by not giving reasons for ignoring the issues presented before the 'table of contents' herein. Both courts were apprised of the questions presented. A timely petition for rehearing was denied on 27 July 1982, by the Ninth Circuit. (App. C)

The decision of the lower courts are unreported.

The district court's jurisdiction is founded on:

(1) the action arises under the Constitution of the United States, Article 5, Amendment 14, Section 1;

(2) jurisdiction is founded on the Act of June 25, 1948, c. 646, 62 Stat. 869, Title 28 U.S.C., Sections 1331 and 1343(3) and (4);

(3) the action arises under 42 U.S.C. Section 1983, Civil Rights Act of 1871.

4. REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT THE DECISION BELOW CONFLICTS WITH DECISIONS OF OTHER CIRCUITS AND THIS COURT ON IMPORTANT ISSUES AFFECTING FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

A. The Decision Below Affirms the Right of a Magistrate in a Summary Judgment Proceeding to Deprive a Plaintiff a Trial on the Merits Concerning Plaintiff's 14th Amendment Section 1 Right to Due Process and therefor Conflicts with the Decisions of other Circuits and this Court on this Matter.

The first issue presented in the petition broadly involves the scope of a Magistrate's authority and discretion to determine issues of fact before trial and before discovery is completed, where the issues of fact involve questions of malice, fraud, the intent of respondent-defs to circumvent the Cal Ed Cd Section 13443 (now section 44949), (App. A at A-3 & A-4), where the complaint alleges respondent-defs' fraud, malice, lying and other forms of corruption. (App. D, at p. D6, line 11; D7, lines 10-28; D8, lines 1-11)

Since Magistrates all over the United States are frequently confronted with this exercise of discretion, this Court should rule on the question 'Whether the Magistrate has the discretion to determine the issues of fact, supra, eliminating the trial court phase of a lawsuit.

The Ninth Cir Panel's decision conflicts with Leow's Inc. v. Bays, 209 F. 2d 610, 19 F. R. Serv. 56 c. 41, (CA 5th, 1954); Cram v. Sun Ins. Office, Ltd., 37t F. 2d 670, 11 F. R. Serv. 2d 56 c. 41, Case 1 (CA 4th, 1967) which held that a district court does not have the right, before trial on the merits, to draw inferences as to a party's good faith or purpose or intent in its wrongful acts, as the misbehaving party's intent and purpose raise genuine issues for the trial court's consideration; because it is at the trial, that the trier of the facts would be in a better position to ascertain and consider the truth in the lawsuit.

The summary judgment relates to pretrial procedures, and not to the merits of a plaintiff's case. A motion for summary judgment is granted not for lack of proof, but for lack of an issue.

Petitioner alleges fraud, malice and proximate cause in his complaint. (App. D, at p. D6, line 11; p. D7 at lines 10-28 and p. D8 at lines 1-11)

The Ninth Cir Panel's decision conflicts with Grass v. Southern Ry. Co., 414 F. 2d 292, 13 F. R. Serv. 2d 56 c, 41, Case 3 (CA 5th 1969), which held that cases raising issues of fraud, malice, proximate cause are peculiarly unsuited for summary judgment, since these issues require a determination of the reasonableness of actions under the circumstances of the case.

It is respectfully submitted that the Magistrate, in a summary judgment proceeding, and the Ninth Cir Panel, should not have taken it upon themselves to determine the issues of whether fraud, malice, bad faith existed; nor to determine questions of fact, such as, whether petitioner was a probationary teacher between September 1962 and June 1964, and again between September 1965 and February 1966, because these are questions to be determined by the trial court (jury), after all parties have submitted evidence.

Only a decision by this Court can resolve the first Question Presented For Review; thus eliminating the conflict between the Ninth Circuit Court's decision and those of other Circuits, and even this court. A grant of certiorari shall preserve uniformity of decision among circuits.

B. There are Constitutional Limitations Upon the Power of Courts to Decide an Action Without Allowing a Party to be Heard on the Merits

This Court held in Societe International Pour Participationes Industrielles et Commerciales, S. A. v. Rogers, 1958, 78 S. Ct. 1087, 1094, 357 U. S. 197, 209, 2 L. Ed. 2d 1255 that there are constitutional limitations upon the power of courts, even in aid of their own valid processes, to decide an action without allowing a party to be heard on the merits.

This denial of petitioner's trial on the merits raises substantial constitutional questions, the gravity of which is accented by the fact that petitioner Calvo is seeking to avoid deprivation of his 14th Amendment right to due process. Here, the petitioner invoked the aid of the lower courts to vindicate his 14th Amendment right to due process.; and is rather in the position of a defendant, since petitioner is challenging the government's (respondents') action by protesting against the deprivation or seizure of petitioner's teaching position and health. And petitioner is seeking the recovery of his teaching post and career, protected by the due process provided by Cal Ed Cd sec. 13443, and compensation for a permanent 'conversion reaction' illness resulting from the circumstances of petitioner's deprivation and denial of the 'due process'. Petitioner's 'teaching post' and 'health' were summarily taken away by the government (respondents) without the opportunity for protest by petitioner, claiming that the seizure was unjustified. To avoid prejudice of petitioner's 14th Amendment due process constitutional rights, the Court should grant certiorari.

C. In its Application of FRCP Rule 36(a) and (b), the Decision Below is in Conflict with its own Ninth Circuit's Decision in O'Campo v. Hardisty, 262 F. 2d 621, 625, (9th Cir 1958), in Conflict with the Decisions of Other Circuits and that of this Court.

Petitioner Calvo won his lawsuit in 1974, because respondents admitted all the allegations in petitioner's complaint. Two sets of REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION OF FACTS were filed - set on March 18, 1974, and another set on October 29, 1974, pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure Rule 36. Respondents did not answer, did not deny, did not object to petitioner's two sets of REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION OF FACTS. Since respondents did not respond to the REQUESTS, the facts contained in the REQUESTS were thereby admitted under FRCP Rule 36(a). (App. A-1, A-2)

Under FRCP Rule 36(b), all facts admitted are conclusively established and need not be proved. (App. A-2, A-3) These facts, contained in the REQUESTS FOR ADMISSIONS, were and are the allegations in the complaint. Therefore, the allegations in the complaint are admitted as true by respondents. Petitioner won his lawsuit in 1974.

This was brought to the attention of the Magistrate at hearings in the spring of 1974 and again at the hearing on November 21, 1977. But the Magistrate refused to acknowledge petitioner's winning of this lawsuit, and rejected the contents of Rule 36.

In O'Compo v. Hardisty, supra, the Court held that failure of a party to answer an opposing party's request for admissions, admits the truth of all matters contained in the request. FRCP Rule 36, 28 U.S.C.

And the admissions in this case clearly show that the actions of respondents were not proper and gave rise to a cause of action. (App. D at ps. D1-D8 & D10-D12; & App. E at ps. E-1 thru E-35).

A review of the docket sheets will show that respondents did not respond to the request for admissions (App. F at ps. F-1 thru F-13)

It is respectfully submitted, the Ninth Cir Panel had no power to ignore or depart from a previous decision of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. In re Jaylaw Drug, Inc., C.A. N.Y. 1980, 621 F. 2d 524; Miller v. San Sebastian Gold Mines Inc., CA Florida 1976, 540 F. 2d 307.

The Ninth Cir Panel's decision is in conflict with: Warren v. International Broth. of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen & Helpers of America, C.A. 8th 1976, 544 F. 2d 334; Adventures in Good Eating v. Best Places to Eat, C.C.A. 7th, 1942, 131 F. 2d 809; U.S. ex rel, Seals v. Wiman, C.A. 5th, 1962, 304 F. 2d 53, 63, certiorari denied, 1963, 83 S. Ct. 717, 372 U.S. 915, 9 L. Ed 2d 722, 83 S. Ct. 741, 372 U.S. 924, 9 L. Ed. 2d 729; City of Rome v. U.S., D.C.D. c. 1978, 450 F. Supp. 378, 383, affirmed 1980, 100 S. Ct. 1548, 446 U.S. 156, 64 L. Ed. 2d 119.

City of Rome held 'Rule 36(a) neither expressly nor implicitly excepts such facts from its requirements. Indeed, the rule expressly states that a party may not refuse to respond to a request merely on the ground that the matter for which an admission has been requested presents a genuine issue for trial.'

The Ninth Cir Panel's decision is in conflict with: Smyth v. Kaufman, C.C.A. 2d, 1940, 114 F. 2d 40, 130 A.L.R. 951; Batson v. Porter, C.C.A. 4th, 1946, 154 F. 2d 566; John Mohr & Sons v. Apex Terminal Warehouses, Inc., C.A. 7th, 1970, 422 F. 2d 638; Chicago, R.I. & P.R. Co. v. Williams, C.A. 8th, 1957, 245 F. 2d 397, certiorari denied, 78 S. Ct. 83, 355 U.S. 855, 2 L. Ed 2d 63; General Steel Prod. Co. v. Lorenz, D.C. Fla. 1962, 204 F. Supp. 518, affirmed C.A. 5th, 1964, 337 F. 2d 726; Mangan v. Broderick & Bascom Rope Co., C.A. 7th, 1965, 351 F. 2d 24, certiorari denied, 86 S. Ct. 930, 383 U. S. 926, 15 L. Ed. 2d 846; McSparran v. Hanigan, D.C. Pa. 1963, 225 F, Supp. 628, 636-637, affirmed, C.A. 3d, 1965, 356 F. 2d 983.

Only a decision by this Court, regarding the application and enforcement of its own Federal Rules of Civil Procedure Rule 36(a & b), can resolve the third Question Presented For Review thus eliminating the conflict within the Ninth Circuit, concerning its decisions, and avoiding future conflict between the Ninth Cir Panel decision and those of this Court, as well as those of other Circuits.

This third Question Presented For Review is substantial and important in the administration of FRCP Rule 36. Settlement of this question is in the public interest. Unequal treatment of petitioner under the FRCP Rules resulting soley from the lower Court's decision can be prevented only through the resolution and supervision by this Court of the third question presented herein. Thus great and grievious harm to petitioner can be avoided.

Apart from petitioner's personal interest, the issue is a continuing one affecting a very large number of cases as to the issue whether Rule 36 and other FRCP Rules need be complied with. In these circumstances, it is believed that it is in the interest not only of the lower court, but of the many

attorneys affected that the matter be definitely resolved at the earliest possible time.

The Ninth Cir Panel's decision affects the course of proceeding in a vast number of cases. To avoid resulting confusion is a matter of substantial importance meriting the granting of the Writ of Certiorari. The Court of Appeals opinion can fairly be characterized as an invitation to this Court to reconsider the applicability of FRCP Rule 36.

CONCLUSION

It is humbly and respectfully submitted that the present case is illustrative of persistent and serious misapplication of the law by the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in connection with an important phase of the judicial business of both that court and this Court. In far too many cases, the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and the district court too, unjustifiably has been turning the appellate and district court process into an obstacle course for pro per litigants. Here, for example, at the time of filing this Petition for Certiorari in August or September 1982, already nine years have elapsed since petitioner Calvo's filing of the complaint in September 1973 (App. D); a mountain of papers has been filed (App. F at ps. F-1 thru F-13); but as yet petitioner has been unable to begin to obtain the trial court determination on the merits which he clearly is entitled to.

The course being followed by the district court and the Court of Appeals frustrates the sound and efficient administration of justice. In cases of this sort, the district court and the Court of Appeals treats 'in propria personas', like petitioner, in a manner which is unjust, discriminatory and unlawful. The lower courts' action threatens the effectiveness of private actions - pro per or pro se actions, as a vital means for correcting due process violations protected by the 14th Amendment. This Court alone can correct the situation, and correction is urgently needed. For the reasons which have been set forth, and because of the public importance of the issues

presented to pro se litigants as a class and to attorneys and their clients, certiorari should be granted.

Indeed, so clear is the error of the Court of Appeals, and so clearly improper and shockingly wrong the action of the district court, it is believed the appropriate relief would be the summary reversal of the decision, with a holding that the entire complaint is conclusively established due to respondents' failure to respond to Requests for Admissions under FRCP Rule 36.

The lower court decision withheld this lawsuit from the jury, which deprived petitioner of his right to a jury trial and decision; and in such situations as petitioner's, this Court consistently granted certiorari. Gibson v. Phillips Petoleum Co., 352 U.S. 874; Dick v. New York Life Ins. Co., 359 U.S. 437. In Wilkerson v. McCarthy, 336 U.S. 70-71, Mr. Justice Douglas justified the policy of the Court in granting review by certiorari, on the ground that 'the criterion governing the exercise of our discretion in granting or denying certiorari is not who loses below, but whether the jury function in passing on disputed questions of fact and in drawing inferences from proven facts has been respected.'

And in another case, the then Court majority said 'Special and important reasons for the grant of certiorari in these cases are certainly present when lower federal and state courts persistently deprive litigants of their right to a jury determination.' Rogers v. Missouri Pacific R. Co., 352 U.S. 500, 510; Gallick v. Baltimore & Ohio R. Co., 372 U.S. 108, 116-117.

The same viewpoint was reflected in Beacon Theatres v. Westover, 359 U.S. 500, 501, where the Court granted certiorari because, quoting from Dimick v. Schiedt, 293 U.S. 474, 486, 'Maintenance of the jury as a fact-finding body is of such importance and occupies so firm a place in our history and jurisprudence that any seeming curtailment of the right to a jury trial should be scrutinized with the utmost care.'

Here, petitioner respectfully invokes an exercise of this Court's power of supervision.

Dated: 4 August 1982.

Respectfully submitted,

FRANK J. CALVO
4312 Saugus Ave.
Sherman Oaks
California 91403
Telephone (213) 784-7967

Pro Se for Petitioner Calvo